

REMARKS

Receipt of the Office Action of December 1, 2004 is gratefully acknowledged. \

The courtesy extended by the examiner to applicant's representative during the telephone interview on March 24, 2005 is also gratefully acknowledged. During the telephone interview the rejections under 35 USC 112, first and second paragraphs were discussed. it was generally agreed that the amendments to claim 6 noted above, with corresponding amendments to claims 7, 8 and 11, would overcome the noted rejections under 35 USC 112, first and second paragraphs. Accordingly, claim 11 should now be in prima facie condition for allowance in accordance with the examiner's indication that "Claim 11 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 USC 112, second paragraph...."

There remains for consideration the rejection of claims 6 and 7 as anticipated under 35 USC 102(b) over Cross et al, and the further rejection of claim 8 as unpatentable under 35 USC 103(a) over Cross et al in view of Japanese 2218509.

These two rejections are respectfully traversed.

Regarding Cross et al, it has previously been noted that Cross et al does not disclose movable blade parts which move relative to each other. If one considers Fig. 3 of the present application as an example of what is claimed in claim 6, it is quite clear that the blade parts 50 **move toward each other**. Consequently, the recitation in claim 6 that the blade parts are movable and that they both move in **lateral directions** should be sufficient to define over Cross et al which has no such arrangement.

Regarding the combination of Cross et al and Japanese 2218509, two movable blade parts is not disclosed so it can add nothing to the teaching of Cross et al which would render claim 6 unpatentable under 35 USC 103. There is nothing in these

U.S. Pat. Appl. 09/926,384

references which teach the skilled artisan that two blades moving toward each other is desirable.

Because claim 6 recites the movement in the lateral direction (i.e., toward each other), it defines patentably over the references cited either alone or in combination.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration is respectfully requested and claims 6 - 8 allowed along with claim 11.

Date: April 1, 2005

Respectfully submitted,
BACON & THOMAS, PLLC



Felix J. D'Ambrosio
Registration No: 25,721

BACON & THOMAS
625 Slaters Lane, Fourth Floor
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
Phone: (703) 683-0500

S:\Producer\jfd\CLIENTS\Osaka Internationa, Suzue Patent\WIZU3002\April 1, 2005 response.wpd